



Pyle, Stephanie

to me ▾

Thu, Aug 1, 1:52 PM (8 days ago)



Hi Michael,

Here is Entergy's response:

We agree that the Alliance's calculation is wrong and state that Alliance was a party to the long-ago decided NOPS litigation and cannot credibly claim that it did not receive all confidential material produced in that docket, which was protected because it is market sensitive information that could negatively impact our customers and our business if released publicly. It is also categorically false that we did not warn the Council that NOPS is needed to address cascading outages and to fulfill a peaking generation need in our initial NOPS filing. The Company is not opposed to alternatives, as we recently announced a 90 MW solar portfolio and proposed a target of 70% clean energy by 2030 (which includes 150 additional MW of grid-scale solar), but New Orleans needs a local, dispatchable resource to address serious reliability risks and other alternatives were simply not feasible. The Company has already prudently invested approximately 140 million in constructing the unit. The Company ran a scenario in its filing that contained transmission and market purchases instead of building NOPS, and it was only 2% less expensive but left New Orleans significantly exposed to reliability risks over the foreseeable future, which the Council rightly rejected.

Thanks,

